

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the official action that issued in the present application on November 25, 2008. The claim amendments included herein are merely clarifying amendments and are not meant to change the intended scope of the claims. Thus, the amendments present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, and they should be entered in due course. Moreover, the amendments are manifest, requiring only a cursory review by the Examiner, thereby providing additional ground for their entry.

Claims 1-16 were pending in the application. In the official action, claims 1-16 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 7, 11, and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-16 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

\$103 Rejections

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton (U.S. Patent No. 7,305,357) in view of Asmussen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042923) in view of Knee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,128).

Applicants submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 5, 7, 11, and 15) are patentable over Hamilton, Asmussen, and Knee (collectively "the cited references").

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward delivery of broadcast content. Each of the claims recites that content control information relating to copy control of the content is included in the control information for obtaining the broadcast program or in the program information. Including the content control information in the control information or the program information allows the

content and corresponding EPG to be shown immediately upon receipt of the broadcast content.

The cited references do not disclose that content control information relating to copy control of content is included in control information for obtaining a broadcast program or in associated program information, and therefore the cited references can not realize the attendant advantages. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 1, 5, 7, 11, and 15 are patentable over the cited references - taken either individually or in combination - on at least this basis.

Further, since dependent claims inherit the limitations of their respective base claims, Applicants believe that dependent claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as discussed in connection with the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 654-5000.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

Application No.: 10/520,684

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-381

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: February 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Bruno Polito/
Bruno Polito
Registration No.: 38,580
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ &
MENTLIK, LLP

972340_1.DOC